UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/651,800	08/30/2000	Simona Cohen	6727/0H610	2081

7590 09/28/2006

Darby & Darby P C
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022

EXAMINER	
STORK, KYLE R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/651,800	COHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kyle R. Stork	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 July 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This non-final office action is in response to the remarks and Declaration filed 14 July 2006.

2. Claims 1-34 are pending. Claims 1, 12, 22, and 30-32 are independent claims. The rejection of claims 1-34 has been withdrawn.

Oath/Declaration

3. The declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 filed on 14 July 2006 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the Swamy et al. reference (US 6874141, filed 29 June 2000).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-3, 6-14, 17-24, and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh et al.(US 6810429, filed 3 February 2000, hereafter Walsh), and further in view of Webber (US 6418400, filed 30 December 1998).

As per independent claim 1, Walsh discloses a method for processing source data from a plurality of diverse sources in a selected data domain, comprising:

- Specifying a unified schema that is defined specifically for the selected data domain, the specified schema listing markup tags in the selected

data domain that can exist in a document in the markup language (column 9, lines 51-67: Here, a DTD is a schema. The DTD defines the information contained in the XML document)

- Defining correspondences of data fields from the source to the markup tags listed by the selected schema (column 10, line 1-28: Here, a mapping defines the correspondence between the XML to the legacy formats and from the underlying database back to the XML format)
- Mapping the source data in accordance with the correspondences to generate unified data in the markup language (column 10, lines 1-28: Here, data is mapped from the database into XML)

Swamy fails to specifically disclose the schema being selected from a plurality of schemata that are specific to different data domains selected from a group of domains consisting of computer system performance evaluation, customer relationship management, healthcare, and telecommunications. Webber discloses schema being selected from a plurality of schemata that are specific to different data domains selected from a group of domains consisting of computer system performance evaluation, customer relationship management, healthcare, and telecommunications (column 8, lines 61-64: Here a DTD is disclosed; column 10, lines 15-22: Here, a plurality of domains, including healthcare, are disclosed). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Webber with Walsh, since it would have allowed a user to map processes for specific transactions to schemas (Webber: column 10, lines 23-26).

As per dependent claim 2, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses wherein the markup language comprises XML (column 10, lines 1-28).

As per dependent claim 3, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses use of a DTD (column 9, lines 52-67).

As per dependent claim 6, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses wherein defining the correspondences comprises selecting one or more of the data fields in the sources to correspond to one of the markup tags in the schema, and determining a conversion function to apply to the one or more data fields (11, line 45- column 12, line 5).

As per dependent claim 7, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses wherein determining the conversion function comprises determining the function so as to generate a data element indicated by the corresponding one of the markup tags (column 11, line 45- column 12, line 31: Here, the DTD is used to specify the mapping between the table data and the corresponding XML markup tags).

As per dependent claim 8, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 6, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses wherein determining the conversion function comprises determining the function to generate an attribute of the unified data indicated by the corresponding one of the

markup tags (column 4, lines 53-60: Here, documents can be added to the data source).

As per dependent claim 9, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh discloses the source data being in a format other than the markup language, and mapping from the source language to the markup language (column 10, lines 1-28: Here, HTML is the markup language and XML is the source language).

As per dependent claim 10, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 1, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses querying the sources by addressing a query to the unified data in the markup language (column 10, lines 1-28).

As per dependent claim 11, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses the method wherein mapping the source data comprise mapping the source data responsive to the query (column 10, lines 1-28).

As per independent claims 12 and 22, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 1. Claims 12 and 22 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 13 and 23, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 2. Claims 13 and 23 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 14 and 24, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 3. Claims 14 and 24 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 17, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 6. Claim 17 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 18 and 29, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 9. Claims 18 and 29 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 19 and 27, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 10. Claims 19 and 27 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 20 and 28, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 11. Claims 20 and 28 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 21, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh further discloses a plurality of distributed data storage devices, which hold the diverse data sources, wherein the processor is adapted to retrieve the source data from the distributed devices (Figure 1a).

As per independent claim 30, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1 and 10. Claim 30 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 31, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claims 1 and 10-11. Claim 31 is similarly rejected.

As per independent claim 32, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 31. Claim 32 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 33, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 11. Claim 33 is similarly rejected.

As per dependent claim 34, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 6. Claim 34 is similarly rejected.

6. Claims 4-5, 15-16, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh and Webber, and further in view of Britton et al. (US 2002/0059344, filed 29 January 1999, hereafter Britton).

As per dependent claim 4, Walsh and Webber disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 2, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Walsh fails to specifically disclose wherein defining the correspondences comprises defining data transformation rules in XSL (Figure 2, item 28). Britton discloses wherein defining the correspondences comprises defining data transformation rules in XSL (paragraph 0026). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Britton with Walsh, since it would have allowed a user to map data from XML to HTML for display within a browser (Britton: paragraph 0026).

As per dependent claim 5, Walsh, Webber, and Britton disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 4, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Britton further discloses wherein mapping the source data comprises transforming the data using an XSL engine (paragraph 0026). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Britton with Walsh, since it would have allowed a user to map data from XML to HTML for display within a browser (Britton: paragraph 0026).

As per dependent claims 15 and 25, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 4. Claims 15 and 25 are similarly rejected.

As per dependent claims 16 and 26, the applicant discloses the limitations substantially similar to those in claim 5. Claims 16 and 26 are similarly rejected.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R. Stork whose telephone number is (571) 272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kyle R Stork
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2178

krs

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER